

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 and 40-47 were pending at the time of the last Office Action. Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, 13, 22, and 40-47 and neither canceled any claims nor presented any new claims. Thus, claims 1-24 and 40-47 are still pending.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for her consideration during the telephone interview of May 26, 2009. During that interview, applicant's representative described applicant's technology and Figure 1 of applicant's specification. Although Figure 1 illustrates formats of a table that may be considered to be in the prior art, applicant's technology provides a way for defining the formats to reduce the need to store the elements of the table redundantly. Thus, although both prior art techniques and applicant's technology may display a table with the same formats, the prior art techniques store the data elements redundantly, whereas applicant's technology avoids this redundancy. Applicant has amended the claims to make it clear that the definition of an element occurs only once in the display description file and thus avoiding the redundancy of the prior art techniques.

The Examiner has objected to claims 41-47. Applicant has amended the claims to address the Examiner's concerns.

The Examiner has rejected claims 13-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended the claims to address the Examiner's concerns. Claims 13-24 now recite a computer system with a storage device and a processor. Such a computer system is a machine under Section 101.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-24 and 40-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the background of applicant's specification and portions of the detailed description including paragraphs 0020, 0021, and 0022. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As an initial matter, applicant would like to point out that the Examiner's assumption is incorrect that paragraphs 0020, 0021, and 0022 constitute an admission of what is described as being prior art. These paragraphs describe applicant's technology relating to use of conditional layout and positioning within a table. The Examiner may be assuming that because paragraph 0022 mentions Figure 1, which illustrates different layouts for tables, applicant is admitting that these paragraphs are prior art. Applicant has made no such admission. Furthermore, applicant knows of no basis in the patent law (e.g., judicial decisions, statutes, or regulations) for such an assumption. Although applicant's technology may well result in displaying tables in the same format as the prior art, applicant's technology uses an approach, as described in the detailed description and as claimed, that is very different from the prior art approach of generating the display of the tables.

Each of applicant's claims recites that a definition of an element can have multiple conditions and layouts. Independent claims 1 and 10 recite "a definition of the element," "a first condition and a first layout for the definition of the element," and "a second condition and a second layout for the definition of the element." Independent claims 13 and 22 recite "a definition of the element and condition and layout pairs for the element." Independent claim 40 recites "a definition of an element; a first condition and a first layout associated with the definition of the element; and a second condition and a second layout associated with the definition of the element."

As described in the background of applicant's specification, Display Description 1 shows a portion of an HTML-like display description that includes two table elements and only one condition for each table element. The data elements A1, A2, A3, B1, B2, and B3 are stored redundantly: once in the top half (i.e., docket==left) and once in the lower half (i.e., docket==bottom). Thus, Display Description 1 stores two definitions of the data elements with each having one condition. Applicant's claims, in contrast, recite an element with multiple conditions as illustrated in Display Description 2, which is neither taught nor suggested by the applicant's background. Because applicant's

element has multiple conditions for a single definition of an element, applicant's technology avoids the redundancy of Display Description 1.

Based upon the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and its early allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-8548.

Please charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 418268006US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: June 11, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By Maurice J. Pirio
Maurice J. Pirio

Registration No.: 33,273
PERKINS COIE LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8548
(206) 359-9000 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant